government fund that was set up specifically to help the U.S. dollar.

To me, this is incredible.

Many questions have yet to be answered about the nature of the peso crisis. Reports that the administration knew long beforehand about the situation of the peso also cause the urgency of the situation to come into serious question. During debate on NAFTA, opponents pointed out that Mexico was highly overvaluing the peso and that provisions must be included in the agreement to stabilize the currency relationship. No such provisions were included in the agreement, and look where were are today.

We just passed a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and we are being asked to swallow this bailout, and we must ask, will U.S. and international loans really help anyone?

In the Washington Post, Jim Glassman argues that the bailout may only make Mexico's long-term economic problems worse. By being too lenient on the Mexican Government, we are encouraging misbehavior in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the teamsters and united electrical workers unions filed unfair labor complaints against Honeywell and GE companies in Mexico—the National Administrative Office dismissed these cases with no penalties for the companies—a blatant disregard for workers' rights.

Likewise, the environment and public health have suffered a great deal. Are NAFTA supporters aware that a GM plant near the border in Mexico bumped a toxic chemical at 215,000 times the acceptable level? It is no wonder that children's cancer rates have increased dramatically be 230 percent in Brownsville TX—230 percent!

In July 1994, a 13-year-old boy from Texas died from a brain infection after swimming in the Rio Grande.

American health officials traced the infection back to the 24 million gallons of raw sewage from Mexico which is pumped into the river each day.

Mr. Speaker, NAFTA is literally poisoning our children and grandchildren.

William Seidman, former Chairman of the FDIC, who was in favor of NAFTA, opposed the administration's original loan guarantee package. Mr. Seidman said that it bore striking similarities to the S&L bailout of the 80's—and he should know. Mr. Speaker, under this new administration plan, taxpayers' dollars are still on the line.

Mr. Speaker, at best, efforts to prop up the peso are simply a political rescue for the new Mexican Government and a bailout for Wall Street. The Mexican and American middle class will see little direct benefit.

At the very least, the peso crisis gives us reason to step back and take a good long look at what's wrong with NAFTA.

In Mexico where the disparity between rich and poor is so great, we need to slow down, reevaluate the integrity of our trading partner and ask ourselves—who really is going to benefit from the loan guarantee.

We must recognize that the peso instability is not a quick fix situation—the loan package will not alter the underlying structural weaknesses of the Mexican economy. A year or so from now, Mexico may be back wanting more financial aid.

When will it end?

We just passed a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and we're being asked to swallow this bailout?

And, we must ask, will U.S. and international loan efforts really help anyone? In the Washington Post, Jim Glassman argues that the bailout may only make Mexico's long-term economic problems worse. By being too lenient on the Mexican Government, we are encouraging misbehavior in the future.

Why not just let the Mexican market fix itself? This admittedly may cause investors to lose money, but they assumed this risk, they deserve little sympathy from American taxpayers.

A major issue in last November's election was the fear, the concern, and the insecurity that the American middle class has about their shrinking standard of living. Now, with NAFTA and this billion dollar bailout, we are not only shipping out middle class jobs, but putting an additional burden on the middle class to subsidize another country.

Since 1979, the United States has lost 16 percent of its manufacturing job base—that is 3.2 million jobs lost. The United States has lost these jobs to Mexico. Not to Mexican companies, but to over 1,600 American-owned plants, plants that employ low paid Mexican workers.

I have already heard from a large number of my constituents urging me to reject the peso bailout. These are the same people who knew that NAFTA was not good for this Country. These are also the same people who go to work everyday, live within their means, and are responsible for their own finances.

Mexico and Wall Street could learn a lot from my constituents.

I have cosponsored legislation to repeal NAFTA and legislation which says that no loan guarantee shall be provided which could result in any direct or indirect financial obligations on the part of the American taxpayer. I urge my colleagues to do the same. The American people deserve nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, how can we in good conscience rush to bailout Mexico when we have thousands of people here at home who desperately need our help—many of whom lost their jobs to Mexico?

I am very disappointed that Congress has been denied this say on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, instead of rescuing Mexico and Wall Street, we need to be helping our own citizens achieve a better way of life.

## UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fox] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in November the American people clearly demonstrated their disgust with outlandish spending, skyrocketing taxes, and a lack of responsiveness from Congress.

The new Republican majority is working hard to eliminate many of the business-as-usual policies and practices of the past, including the onerous burden of unfunded mandates. The burden of unfunded Federal mandates has become an albatross for many State and local governments and impacts nearly every community at some level.

As a former Montgomery County commissioner in Pennsylvania and a former member of the Pennsylvania State House of Representatives, I have seen firsthand the devastating financial effects such unfunded programs have had on municipal, county, and State budgets.

If the Congress really believes in a program, then the Congress should pay for that program. We can no longer pass the buck on to others. The practice has to end here and now.

Honest reform and accountable government are not only what the public wants to see, they are the right things to do. The American people are sick of legislation which uses smoke and mirrors and accomplishes nothing. We need effective reform, which clearly marks the 104th Congress as different from the rest. Ending unfunded Federal mandates should be at the top of this list.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MENENDEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. EHLERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MARTINI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]